SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IX, No. 18 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 November 1, 1979

HEW Auditors Weigh Crackdown on Academe

Under fire from Congress for alleged laxness in supervising the use of its money by academic institutions, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is seriously considering a scheme for financially penalizing universities that fail to abide by its bookkeeping rules.

The specifics of the plan, which have been released in recent months to only a handful of academic finance officials, are likely to send chills through a scientific community already raging against government accounting regulations.

Under the new plan, HEW would be allowed to reduce future grants and contracts by as much as 10 per cent for any university that is believed to have made "unsupportable" federal expenditures. Where a university or medical school is found to have misspent federal money, HEW would be allowed not only to demand repayment of the funds but also to impose a 9 per cent interest penalty on the institution. And in situations where they are dubious about expenditures claimed by an institution, government auditors would be allowed to use whatever "non-statistical estimating techniques" they deem necessary to develop estimates of unallowed costs.

Latest Figures on Federal R&D Spending---Page 5

The plan is not yet official, but the financial experts who have seen the 53-page document say they are worried that HEW may start using the new sanctions without going through the normal process of publishing the recommendations in the *Federal Register* for general public comment.

Department officials aren't offering much clarification about how, when, or if at all the plan might be put into operation. One official in HEW's audit division simply said that "it could be months or even years" before the new document would go into effect. An official in HEW's Office of Grant and Contract Financial Management said that some of the issues were controversial enough to warrant special consideration by HEW Secretary Patricia Roberts Harris.

It is generally assumed that the new regulations are the result of recent accusations that HEW has failed to keep adequate track of its multi-billion dollar research budget (SGR Vol. IX, No. 12).

The latest criticism of HEW's audit policies came this summer when the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources held hearings on the accountability of educational institutions for federal funds and the effectiveness of federal audits.

The hearings were based, in part, on a report issued to Congress last June by the General Accounting Office. The report, titled "Grant Auditing: A Maze of Inconsistency, Gaps, and Duplication that Needs Overhauling," accused HEW and other federal agencies of conducting too many audits on some institutions, while failing to conduct enough on others.

After sampling federally supported activities at 20 institutions, the GAO concluded that procedures for auditing federal grant recipients were "uncoordinated, ineffective, and inefficient."

HEW officials have argued in response that the problems are not so much the fault of their Department

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Several staff assistants who have looked after scientific and health-related legislation for Senator Edward Kennedy are in the process of being detached from Congressional duties to join the Kennedy campaign staff. Nothing announced yet, but it's expected that Anne Strauss, the Senator's chief aide for NSF affairs, will join the campaign, as will Lawrence Horowitz, the Rasputin of health insurance and drug reform.

Detailed reports on R&D expenditures in the nations of the European Economic Community are available in the EEC's latest edition of Government Financing of Research and Development 1970-1978. *Copies available in the US for $17 each from: European Community Information Service, 2100 M St. Nw., Suite 707, Washington, DC 20037; tel. (202) 862-9500.*

The salaries of physicians of all major specialties averaged $63,000 in 1978 — compared to $41,800 in 1970 — according to the American Medical Association, but there were big variations among the specialties. At the top was surgery, $75,800; psychiatry was the lowest, at $49,500. Data are from *Profile of Medical Practice 1979*, 290 pages, $6 per copy, available from Order Dept. OP-70, AMA, PO Box 821, Monroe, Wisconsin 53566. A companion volume, *Socioeconomic Issues of Health 1979*, 263 pages, consisting mainly of essays, is also available — same price and address.

. . . University Associations Register Protests

(Continued from Page 1)

as they are the result of failures by the universities to establish sound accounting systems.

The rules now being considered, explained an HEW official, would require institutions to implement the "necessary reforms in their accounting systems to show us what's really going on on campus. If they do not, the Department will take firm action." The interest requirements and the grant reductions, he said, would be used only as a "last resort."

In 1978 HEW auditors claimed that the institutions under their jurisdiction (which includes about 94 per cent of the nation's 2500 colleges and universities) could not properly account for at least $86.5 million in federal research funds. Although much of this money may, in fact, have been properly spent, government officials contend that because of inadequate documentation at the universities, there is no way of knowing for sure.

For their part, the university officials contend that government regulations are cumbersome and inappropriate to the kind of activities carried out in their institutions.

One of the most recent as well as most serious conflicts between the universities and the government concerns the regulations contained in the Office of Management and Budget's Circular A-21. The regulations, which went into effect October 1, establish a new method of figuring both the direct costs of paying salaries and purchasing materials under federal grants and contracts and the indirect expenses involved in conducting that research, including the costs of utilities, equipment depreciation, and overall university administration.

While the OMB has agreed to relax many of the most troublesome provisions in the new circular, university officials continue to object to the accounting procedures, on the grounds that they impose unnecessary and often unworkable constraints on research. For example, university officials contend they cannot hope to keep track of salaries and expenses the way the circular requires them to do. Teachers and researchers, university business officers contend, simply do not conduct their business in an orderly, easily measurable fashion.

Such conflicts between the government's need for accountability of the funds it grants and the universities' desire for flexibility in the research it conducts present "a serious, almost unsolvable dilemma," the proposed audit manual explains.

Since university research costs are often not documented, it is also not possible to determine precisely "how much is proper and should be allowed, and how much is improper and should be disallowed," the manual says.

When faced with this situation, the document continues, the Department has two obvious options: either disallow all the costs because the institution has not proved they are allowable or allow all the costs the university claims because the government cannot show that they are improper. While the former solution would result in many institutions going bankrupt, the latter approach would be unfair to institutions that have been willing to carry out the government rules.

Despite such justifications, university representatives are expressing grave misgivings about what impact the new audit manual could have on their institutions.

Frederick M. Bohen, HEW's Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget, has received formal complaints from the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Committee on Governmental Relations for the National Association of College and University Business Officers, a professional advisor to the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA), and several other state and local groups.

So far, the most optimistic note in the university response has come from Howard Wile, the NCURA advisor, who said he assumed — or at least hoped — the proposed sanctions were more of a "trial balloon than a serious proposal." — Anne Roark (The author is an Assistant Editor for *The Chronicle of Higher Education.)*

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1979

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor
Anne Roark

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Susan Burke

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $89.50 (two years, $168.50); individuals, $48.50 (two years, $82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

OTA Gets Some Smooth Sailing For a Change

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), the Congressional think-tank for examining the long-term technical implications of federal policy decisions, seems to have been given a temporary reprieve from its usual diet of attacks by critics in and out of the organization.

A hearing held in early October by the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology not only failed to turn up much new in the way of problems at OTA, but the session also demonstrated a sympathetic wait-and-see attitude about the future of the agency.

According to a committee staff member, John Holmfeld, there is "less than a 50-50 chance" that Congress will go ahead with any of the various schemes to reorganize OTA that have been discussed in recent years. "Of course, he added, "one day of hearings is not enough. There'll probably be hearings next session" and a good deal more "looking" into the current operation of the Office.

For now, however, the future seems to be fairly rosy, with OTA getting through the fiscal 1980 budget process without a cut in its $11-million budget request. Many of the members of its authorizing committee, including Chairman George E. Brown Jr. (D-Cal.), also seem at least as interested in hearing what OTA's new Director, John H. Gibbons, has to say about how he wants to run the Office as they are in telling him how they think the job ought to be done.

Gibbons came to OTA last April from the University of Tennessee, where he had been director of the Tennessee Environment Center since 1974. Before that, he was Director of Conservation in the Federal Energy Administration for two years, and prior to that, he spent 19 years at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, where he managed programs in nuclear geophysics and environmental quality.

After nearly half a year in Washington, Gibbons said he is impressed with the "quiet but extensive and diverse ways that OTA assists various committees of the Congress in addition to the development of the long-term formal project studies." A continuing "mix" of activities is what the new Director advocates, at least for the short-term future of the Office.

While the long-term studies of the effects of technology are critical, Gibbons contends that it is important for the Office to be responsive to short-term Congressional requests. For example, he said, the Office should serve as a kind of "honest broker or in-house expert/referee on technical matters where sharply

(Continued on Page 4)

In Case You Wonder What's Going on at Nuclear Commission

The following excerpt is from "Proposed Policy and Procedures for Differing Professional Opinions," now being circulated for comment by the Office of Management and Program Analysis of the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

●

Normal Differing Views vs. Differing Professional Opinions

A *normal differing view,* developed in the free and open discussion of work matters, becomes a *differing professional opinion* only when the originator brings it to NRC management attention in accordance with these procedures.

In the free and open discussion of work matters, professional differences of opinion are common. Employees may also develop critical views concerning matters other than their personal work assignments, such as issues under consideration in another part of NRC or relating to an agency practice or position that is neither currently under review nor in the agency's decision-making process.

In both these instances, employees normally try and should be encouraged to resolve their concerns through discussions with their co-workers and immediate supervisors. In some cases, this may lead to a suggestion as part of the NRC suggestions program (NRC Manual Chapter 4154).

However, these informal discussions may not resolve the matter and an employee may be convinced that the agency and the public would be better served if another opinion prevailed. To further pursue such concerns, an employee should submit a signed, written statement of differing professional opinion in accordance with these procedures. With the submission of this written statement, the employee's differing view becomes a differing professional opinion.

An employee may not use these procedures for differing professional opinions without submitting a written statement. He may, however, express his concerns orally or in writing to the ACRS [Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards] and may also discuss these concerns with any NRC manager as provided in the Open Door Policy. (See Procedure No. 6.) A manager is an employee who directs the work of an organization, is held accountable for the success of specific line or staff programs or activities, and whose primary duties are managerial.

. . . Board Approves New-Style Report for OTA

(Continued from Page 3)

different expert opinions have been presented before the Congress."

If a choice of activities must be made, however, Gibbons said he would opt for the long-term formal assessments and their spinoffs that have been characteristic of OTA since its inception in 1974.

To assure that he has the authority to set such priorities, Gibbons has persuaded OTA's Congressional Board of Directors — the Technology Assessment Board — to make OTA priorities and procedures explicit.

At that meeting, held in September, the Board set up budget-planning guidelines which will reserve approximately 70 percent of OTA's funds for formal assessments, 20 percent for pre-proposal work to study what issues the Office should be assessing, and 10 percent to be used for short-term special responses to Congressional requests.

A "limited discretionary authority" also was given to the Director to help in the preparation of proposals and to provide quick responses to special requests made by lawmakers.

To minimize delays in getting completed reports published and out to those who have requested them, the Board "streamlined" the bureaucratic process by which the reports are approved.

The Board also agreed to establish a new form of communication, known as the "Technical Memorandum," which will enable OTA to release information derived from, but not the formal result of, Board-approved studies.

Besides regaling the subcommittee with the sort of work OTA is capable of doing, Gibbons had a number of comments to make on OTA's management — a subject which is of considerable interest to the lawmakers who approved his appointment.

After the turbulence of the Emilio Q. Daddario and Russell W. Peterson years, many Congressmen agreed that OTA needed an experienced manager who could work closely and quietly with OTA's Congressional bosses.

While Gibbons said he does not intend to neglect his responsibilities to Congress, he also insisted at the hearing this month that his job has other components that cannot be overlooked, including the intellectual leadership of the Office, its administrative direction and guidance, and its links with various constituents, including other research institutions and the public.

In the past, some critics have argued that OTA relies too much on outside consultants while others have said it does not use them enough. Gibbons' answer to such charges is to recommend that Congress place "minimal constraints" on his staffing decisions.

"It would be counter-productive," he explained, "for me to seek a larger than necessary staff that would tend to constrain my opportunities to tap resources outside the agency."

As for the policy guidance OTA should get from outside groups, Gibbons feels that such direction is sorely needed.

"There is a need for continuing high-level guidance from a group of individuals from outside the legislative branch that complements the Congressional guidance obtained mostly through" OTA's Board.

Although it has been subject to considerable criticism for having too little authority, the Technology Assessment Advisory Council is a group of experts and other

(Continued on Page 5)

Foreign Aid R&D Head Picked

The White House has selected a director — Nyle C. Brady, head of the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines — for the newly established Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation. But ISTC, which came into being after long legislative wrangling, faces a serious difficulty: the Senate is dragging on giving it money, though the new fiscal year began October 1.

The House has approved $23.8 million for ISTC, plus some $60 million in funds that were previously provided for the former Agency for International Development. But the Senate has voted against any appropriation, in line with the argument that this is no time to be starting up new federal agencies.

The outcome in such matters is usually a compromise between zero and whatever figure has been approved by either chamber. So, it is likely that ISTC will come to life and pursue its assigned task of promoting research relevant to the needs of the developing nations. Its hard legislative birth, however, clearly signals that the Congress is far from enthusiastic about still another effort to apply research to economic development, which means that those fans of ISTC who were talking about the Institute rapidly moving toward the fiscal scale of the National Science Foundation — which is now a touch below the $1-billion-a-year mark — may have to revise their expectations.

Brady, whose nomination has not yet been formally announced by the White House, has been at the Rice Research Institute for the past six years. He holds a PhD from North Carolina State College and formerly taught at Cornell University.

Federal R&D Money: How Much and Who Gets It

Below are the latest tabulations on federal money for research and development, as compiled by the official scorekeeper, the National Science Foundation, for the forthcoming edition of its annual series Federal Funds for Research and Development. *The table is from that work's appendix, which will be published within a few weeks; the final published version, appendix plus commentary, will be published near the end of the year.*

Summary of Federal Funds for Research, Development, and R&D Plant:
FISCAL YEARS 1978, 1979, and 1980

(Millions of Dollars)

ITEM	ACTUAL 1978	ESTIMATES 1979	ESTIMATES 1980
Total Outlays for Research, Development, and R&D Plant	25,705.0	29,005.1	31,072.3
Research and Development	24,597.2	27,663.0	29,604.8
R&D Plant	1,107.8	1,342.0	1,467.5
Total Obligations for Research, Development, and R&D Plant	27,710.0	31,007.7	32,228.3
Research and Development	26,414.3	29,576.0	30,732.9
PERFORMERS:			
Federal Intramural (1)	6,882.0	7,521.5	7,747.4
Industrial Firms	11,839.5	13,651.0	14,267.0
FFRDCs Administered by Industrial Firms	1,242.5	1,254.7	1,268.8
Universities and Colleges	3,399.5	3,864.3	4,047.6
FFRDCs Administered by Universities and Colleges	1,325.6	1,411.4	1,499.7
Other Nonprofit Institutions	1,017.6	1,139.9	1,090.4
FFRDCs Administered by Nonprofit Institutions	315.9	328.6	396.1
State and Local Governments	268.4	280.2	288.8
Foreign	123.2	124.3	127.1
Research	9,750.9	10,889.2	11,593.3
PERFORMERS:			
Federal Intramural (1)	3,216.9	3,546.0	3,714.2
Industrial Firms	1,792.7	2,051.0	2,287.3
FFRDCs Administered by Industrial Firms	235.2	248.5	282.1
Universities and Colleges	2,932.6	3,340.5	3,487.3
FFRDCs Administered by Universities and Colleges	714.9	751.9	837.5

(Continued on Page 6)

OTA *(Continued from Page 4)*

outside individuals which is supposed to help set priorities for the Office. If the Council did not exist, Gibbons said, he would propose the establishment of a "visiting committee" to provide guidance for OTA. But it is not clear whether Gibbons wants a new advisory structure or whether he should be taken at his word that he has "no strong feelings" about the appropriateness of the Council's size or the methods by which its members are chosen.

He did argue, however, that the Council's job would be "more interesting" and its relationship with the Board more clearly defined if the whole Council would meet regularly only twice each year, with special meetings scheduled as necessary.

Despite the many references to the sort of research assessments OTA is capable of assembling, Gibbons failed to discuss, in any critical detail, the real usefulness of OTA's work to the legislative process.

Many critics, including Gibbons's immediate predecessor, Russell Peterson, have expressed doubt that OTA really fulfills its stated mission of providing Congress with long-term assessments relevant to the legislative process.

In his new role as Director of the National Audubon Society, Peterson argues that he is now in a much better position to make use of OTA reports than he was when he was in direct command of the Congressional Office.

"The real way you get things done in America," Peterson said, "is through grassroots citizen action."

Because Congressmen are interested in getting reelected, Peterson reasoned, "they pay much less attention to an expert, even a whole office full of them, than they do to constituents back home."

Which is another way of saying that when Congress seeks assistance from scholarship, what it's really looking for is support for its preconceptions.

. . . Spending Details from Upcoming NSF Study

(Continued from Page 5)

Other Nonprofit Institutions	593.0	646.6	657.1
FFRDCs Administered by Nonprofit Institutions	66.9	88.5	90.3
State and Local Governments	128.8	141.4	151.6
Foreign	69.9	74.9	85.9
FIELDS OF SCIENCE:			
Life Sciences	3,430.1	3,896.5	3,993.0
Psychology	192.5	208.0	228.8
Physical Sciences	1,683.4	1,846.9	2,063.6
Environmental Sciences	1,050.2	1,180.0	1,288.5
Mathematics and Computer Sciences	235.6	275.6	315.5
Engineering	2,445.9	2,659.0	2,795.0
Social Sciences	506.9	560.3	575.4
Other Sciences NEC [Not Elsewhere Classified]	206.2	262.9	333.5
Basic Research	3,699.1	4,205.1	4,537.6
PERFORMERS:			
Federal Intramural (1)	1,046.6	1,156.5	1,202.5
Industrial Firms	237.8	278.4	333.9
FFRDCs Administered by Industrial Firms	65.4	70.4	80.6
Universities and Colleges	1,754.5	2,050.0	2,200.3
FFRDCs Administered by Universities and Colleges	356.8	381.9	442.1
Other Nonprofit Institutions	190.6	211.1	219.2
FFRDCs Administered by Nonprofit Institutions	5.8	7.4	9.2
State and Local Governments	17.1	19.4	18.5
Foreign	24.6	29.9	31.2
FIELDS OF SCIENCE:			
Life Sciences	1,572.4	1,841.0	1,904.0
Psychology	80.4	89.6	94.2
Physical Sciences	922.4	1,031.4	1,168.5
Environmental Sciences	527.9	578.4	633.8
Mathematics and Computer Sciences	92.2	105.8	121.3
Engineering	344.2	386.0	422.9
Social Sciences	124.2	130.6	132.6
Other Sciences NEC [Not Elsewhere Classified]	35.4	42.4	60.1
Applied Research	6,051.8	6,684.1	7,055.7
PERFORMERS:			
Federal Intramural (1)	2,170.3	2,389.5	2,511.6
Industrial Firms	1,555.0	1,772.5	1,953.4
FFRDCs Administered by Industrial Firms	169.8	178.1	201.4
Universities and Colleges	1,178.0	1,290.5	1,287.1
FFRDCs Administered by Universities and Colleges	358.1	369.9	395.4
Other Nonprofit Institutions	402.4	435.5	438.0
FFRDCs Administered by Nonprofit Institutions	61.2	81.0	81.0
State and Local Governments	111.8	122.0	133.1
Foreign	45.3	45.0	54.7
FIELDS OF SCIENCE:			
Life Sciences	1,857.7	2,055.5	2,088.9
Psychology	112.1	118.5	134.5
Physical Sciences	761.0	815.5	895.1
Environmental Sciences	522.4	601.6	654.7
Mathematics and Computer Sciences	143.3	169.8	194.2
Engineering	2,101.7	2,273.0	2,372.1
Social Sciences	382.7	429.7	442.8
Other Sciences NEC [Not Elsewhere Classified]	170.8	220.5	273.3
Development	16,663.4	18,686.8	19,139.6
PERFORMERS:			
Federal Intramural (1)	3,665.1	3,975.4	4,033.3
Industrial Firms	10,046.8	11,600.0	11,979.7
FFRDCs Administered by Industrial Firms	1,007.3	1,006.2	986.8
Universities and Colleges	467.0	523.8	560.3
FFRDCs Administered by Universities and Colleges	610.8	659.6	662.2

InQuotes: Dr. Press, Meet Dr. Press

". . . one of industry's most persistent complaints has been the inhibiting effects of Federal regulation. Over the past year, I have had occasion to meet with a number of vice presidents for R&D from industry to discuss these matters. A common theme that ran through these meetings was that Federal regulation was hampering innovation. . .

"But I rarely heard recognition of the other sides to these arguments. And there are other sides. Prior to the new rules, many products were not adequately tested and evaluated in terms of environmental and consumer safety before marketing, hence the public demanded much of that regulation. There was new evidence continually being developed that, in the face of scientific uncertainty or inconclusiveness, prompted a certain conservatism in considering risks . . . And it is the government's role and responsibility to protect the public and consider the social costs — the broad effects on the environment and the public health — that were once 'externalities' to the business community."

—Excerpts from an address by Frank Press, White House Science Adviser, May 18, 1978, at MIT.

●

"The pursuit of our Consumer Society, while it has brought many benefits to many people, has also brought some less desirable effects:

"It has made us an adversary society but one less willing to face adversity. It has enlightened but also confused people, often oversimplifying complex problems. (Perhaps never before have so many positions been defended with so little understanding — and so little willingness to compromise for mutual benefits).

"It has made us extremely security conscious, perhaps overly concerned about personal risk at the expense of certain risk-taking needed to move us ahead as a society."

Excerpts from an address by Frank Press, September 28, 1979, at Harvard.

New Publications: World Military, Soviet R&D Studies

World Military and Social Expenditures 1979, produced by Ruth L. Sivard, former chief of the economics division, US Arms Control Disarmament Agency, provides dismaying details of nation-by-nation spending on military and non-military activities, including world totals for military R&D since 1960: $370 billion: 36 pages, $2.50 per copy, available from: World Priorities, Inc., Box 1003, Leesburg, Va. 22075: tel. (703) 777-6444 or (202) 337-4218.

Science and Technology in the Soviet Union: A Profile, a brief and clear description of the organization and administration of the Soviet research enterprise, prepared, with NSF support, by a group at The George Washington University headed by Ursula M. Kruse-Vaucienne and John M. Logsdon; 90 pages, available without charge, from: Graduate Program in Science, Technology and Public Policy, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052.

R&D MONEY *(Continued from Page 6)*

Other Nonprofit Institutions	424.6	493.3	433.3
FFRDCs Administered by Nonprofit Institutions	249.0	240.2	305.9
State and Local Governments	139.6	138.8	137.2
Foreign	53.2	49.4	41.2
R&D Plant	1,295.7	1,431.8	1,495.4
PERFORMERS SUPPORTED:			
Federal Intramural	518.0	441.9	512.6
Industrial Firms	76.9	257.0	242.0
FFRDCs Administered by Industrial Firms	257.0	225.3	244.4
Universities and Colleges	54.6	74.0	41.2
FFRDCs Administered by Universities and Colleges	376.3	418.6	440.7
Other Nonprofit Institutions	4.4	5.5	5.8
FFRDCs Administered by Nonprofit Institutions	8.3	9.2	8.5
State and Local Governments	–	.3	.2
Foreign	.1	–	–

(1) Costs associated with the administration of Intramural and Extramural Programs are covered as well as actual intramural performance.
SOURCE: National Science Foundation

Ford Motor Co. Appoints Science Council

Following behind General Motors by several years, the Ford Motor Company has established a big-name Research Advisory Council which is to meet three times a year "to evaluate Ford's total research effort."

Chairing the Council is William O. Baker, Chairman of the Board of Bell Telephone Laboratories. The other members are: John D. Baldeschwieler, Professor of Chemistry, Caltech; John G. Truxal, Professor of Engineering, Stony Brook; Franz F. Pischinger, Director of the Institute of Applied Thermodynamics, University of Aachen (West Germany), and David S. Saxon, President of the University of California.

Just what these superstar councils do in the few days a year that they get together isn't at all clear. Some contend that these weighty names are signed on by industry mainly to intimidate regulatory bureaucrats. (The first head of GM's council was Nobel laureate Charles Townes). According to this cynical view of the practice, there's no need for the advisors themselves to get involved in any disputes; rather, when dickering is going on at middle levels, the invocation of great names as company advisers is supposed to produce tremors in civil servants. But that's a pretty simplistic view.

What's more likely the case is that big American industry, under regulatory pressure from Washington and competitive pressure from abroad, has at last soaked up the argument that it's been under-exploiting important technological opportunities. A panel of scientific luminaries costs very little — $10,000 to $20,000 a year is probably the going price per man — and, who knows, they might come up with something useful.

●

Omi Walden is out of the job of Assistant Energy Secretary for Conservation and Solar Applications, but she's not out of the Department of Energy. Ms. Walden, it may be recalled, was recently reported to have been fired during an encounter in an elevator with DOE's newly appointed No. 2 man, Deputy Director John C. Sawhill. Her office denied this report, which originated in *The Washington Post,* but it now does seem that, fired or not, Walden's star is not on the rise at the turbulent DOE, for, from the elevated rank of Assistant Secretary she has gone on to fill the newly created, hierarchically ambiguous position of "Advisor to the Secretary for Conservation and Solar Marketing."

Asked why this is happening and whether it represents movement up or down, a DOE spokesman discreetly advised SGR that DOE's assistant secretaries are presidential appointees, whereas secretarial advisors are not, and that "you can draw your own conclusion."

The unannounced but rumored successor for Walden is Tom Stelson, a research administrator at Georgia Tech. Walden held public jobs in Georgia and was director of the Georgia Energy Office immediately prior to joining DOE, in August 1978.

●

The White House has announced the nomination of Nathan J. Stark for Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Stark, Vice Chancellor for Health Professions at the University of Pittsburgh, would succeed Hale Champion, who resigned last spring to return to Harvard. Nominated for HEW General Counsel was Joan Z. Bernstein, who currently holds that post at the Environmental Protection Agency.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

00006 SSSS
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106